FULL NAME Marquice Bruce COMMITTED NAME (if different) 3102 E Highland Avenue FULL ADDRESS INCLUDING NAMBOF INSTITUTION Patton, Ca 92369 PRISON NUMBER (if applicable)	CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT L 2 9 224 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA DEPUTY
UNITED STATES I CENTRAL DISTRIC	
Marquice Bruce PLAINTIFF, V. Twin Fowers County Facility Et al., DEFENDANT(S).	CASE NUMBER To be supplied by the Clerk CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLAINT PURSUANT TO (Check one) 42 U.S.C. § 1983 Bivens v. Six Unknown Agents 403 U.S. 388 (1971)
A. PREVIOUS LAWSUITS	
1. Have you brought any other lawsuits in a federal cou	rt while a prisoner: ☐ Yes 📈 No
2. If your answer to "1." is yes, how many?	
Describe the lawsuit in the space below. (If there is a attached piece of paper using the same outline.)	nore than one lawsuit, describe the additional lawsuits on an

a.	Plaintiff Nonquice Brace
	Defendants Twin Towers, Gargolezy Leona, Monan
b.	Court
c.	Docket or case number 5:24CV952
d.	Name of judge to whom case was assigned AIKA SAGAR
e.	Disposition (For example: Was the case dismissed? If so, what was the basis for dismissal? Was it
	appealed? Is it still pending?)
f.	Issues raised:
g.	Approximate date of filing lawsuit:
h.	Approximate date of disposition
осо . На	there a grievance procedure available at the institution where the events relating to your current complaint curred? Yes \sum No ave you filed a grievance concerning the facts relating to your current complaint? Yes \sum No your answer is no, explain why not
	the grievance procedure completed? A Yes No
. Ple	
. 110	ease attach copies of papers related to the grievance procedure.
	ease attach copies of papers related to the grievance procedure. SDICTION
URIS	SDICTION
URIS	
URIS This co	SDICTION
	b. c. d. e. f. SXHA Is: occ Is:

on	(date or date	s) $\frac{\text{Apv}(1, 2022)}{\text{(Claim II)}}$, $\frac{\text{(Claim II)}}{\text{(Claim II)}}$	m III)
NC		n need not name more than one defendant or allege more than one claim. If yo (5) defendants, make a copy of this page to provide the information for addit	
1.	Defendant	Twin Tower Correctional Facility (full name of first defendant) 450 Bauchet \$51 hA, [a 400] 2 (full address of first defendant)	
		(defendant's position and title, if any)	
	The defenda	ant is sued in his/her (Check one or both): 🗆 individual 🏻 🛱 official capacity	
	Cause	v this defendant was acting under color of law: And Neglected to rector recognize By Marquice Bruce	the government
2.	Defendant	Gonzolez (full name of first defendant)	resides or works at
		(full address of first defendant)	
		(defendant's position and title, if any)	
	The defend	ant is sued in his/her (Check one or both): individual ficial capacity	
	Ordere	v this defendant was acting under color of law: Personnel to Carry out different Acts wice Bruce While dissmissing Greivene	
3.	Defendant	(full name of first defendant) 450 Bauchet St LA, Ca 40012 (full address of first defendant)	resides or works at
		(defendant's position and title, if any)	
	The defend	ant is sued in his/her (Check one or both): individual official capacity	<i>7</i> .
	Order	w this defendant was acting under color of law: ing Medical Personnel to Screen Marquic esults but deny treatment.	e Bruce(s)

Case 5:24-cv-00952-SSS-AS Document 23 Filed 07/29/24 Page 4 of 18 Page ID #:203

4.	Defendant	(full name of first defendant)	resides or works at
		450 Bauchet st LA, Ca 90012 (full address of first defendant)	
		(defendant's position and title, if any)	
	The defend	ant is sued in his/her (Check one or both): ☐ individual	
	Explain ho	w this defendant was acting under color of law:	
	Gave	Nursing Staff reason for denying Man	rawire Bruce
		atment	/
5.	Defendant		resides or works at
		(full name of first defendant)	
		(full address of first defendant)	
		(defendant's position and title, if any)	
	The defend	lant is sued in his/her (Check one or both): ☐ individual ☐ official capacity	
	Explain ho	w this defendant was acting under color of law:	

	LAIMS* CLAIM I
I	the following civil right has been violated:
_	
_	
_	
_	
_	
C	
C	iting legal authority or argument. Be certain you describe, in separately numbered paragraphs, exactly what each
C	iting legal authority or argument. Be certain you describe, in separately numbered paragraphs, exactly what each
C	iting legal authority or argument. Be certain you describe, in separately numbered paragraphs, exactly what each
C	iting legal authority or argument. Be certain you describe, in separately numbered paragraphs, exactly what each
C	iting legal authority or argument. Be certain you describe, in separately numbered paragraphs, exactly what each
C	iting legal authority or argument. Be certain you describe, in separately numbered paragraphs, exactly what each
C	iting legal authority or argument. Be certain you describe, in separately numbered paragraphs, exactly what each
C	iting legal authority or argument. Be certain you describe, in separately numbered paragraphs, exactly what each
C	iting legal authority or argument. Be certain you describe, in separately numbered paragraphs, exactly what each
c	iting legal authority or argument. Be certain you describe, in separately numbered paragraphs, exactly what each
c	iting legal authority or argument. Be certain you describe, in separately numbered paragraphs, exactly what each
c	iting legal authority or argument. Be certain you describe, in separately numbered paragraphs, exactly what each
C	upporting Facts: Include all facts you consider important. State the facts clearly, in your own words, and witho iting legal authority or argument. Be certain you describe, in separately numbered paragraphs, exactly what each DEFENDANT (by name) did to violate your right.
C	iting legal authority or argument. Be certain you describe, in separately numbered paragraphs, exactly what each
c	iting legal authority or argument. Be certain you describe, in separately numbered paragraphs, exactly what each
c	iting legal authority or argument. Be certain you describe, in separately numbered paragraphs, exactly what each

E.	REQ	UEST	FOR	REL	JEF
----	-----	------	------------	-----	-----

I believe that I am entitled to the following specific relief:
- Full medical Bills Paid
- Court And Lawyer Fees Paid
- Court And lawyer Fees Paid - Pain And Suffering
- 1038 W/O 0008
- loss wages - Family Support
- Full Pandan
and Pay Marquire Bource the Sum of
- Full Pardon and Pay Marquice Bruce the Sum of
\$350,000,000 - million dallars
(Date) Murance But (Signature of Plaintiff)
(Date) (Signature of Plaintiff)

Claim I

The Complaint against Twin Tower County Facility is based Apon the Food Poisoning that accured while the Margaice Bruce was housed in the 142 Modualar The abuse started April 11 2022 personnel involved is Gonzolez, Leora, Moran, who did more then conspire these individual acted with Malice Moran openly accused Margnice Bruce of being a Molester after Gonzolez wishandle Food Gave Leora a burrito that was received From another inmate with knowlege that the Food was Tampered that Gonzolez had prepared to be served to Marguice Bruce For a result that Marquice Bruce would become ill and Pass away or have to require surgery in the Near future. With out medically addressing Health issues that was caused by Personnel and neglected At A time

Marquice Bruce Request that 142 Moduel Fodage be investigated for Proof in time

April 11, 2022 to July 15th 2022 and Grieveners that are out side that time frame is the Continuance of ABuse

Regnest to Amend

Morgane Board

1 2 3 4 5 6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 7 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA - EASTERN DIVISION 8 9 Case No. EDCV 24-0952-SSS (AS) MARQUICE BRUCE, 10 Plaintiff, 11 ORDER DISMISSING COMPLAINT V. 12 WITH LEAVE TO AMEND TWIN TOWERS COUNTY FACILITY, 13 et al., 14 Defendants. 15 16 INTRODUCTION 17 18 On May 3, 2024, Marquice Bruce ("Plaintiff"), a California 19 detainee proceeding pro se, filed a Civil Rights Complaint 20 ("Complaint") pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against the Twin Towers 21 County Facility ("Twin Towers") in Los Angeles, California, and 22 three Twin Towers correctional officers - Leora, Gonzalez, and 23 Moran - sued in their individual capacities. 1 (Dkt. No. 1). The 24 25

26

27

¹ On May 30, 2024, in this same action, Plaintiff also filed a "Request for Hearing and Petition for Habeas Corpus to Dismiss a Felony Complaint" ("Request"). (Dkt. No. 5). Based on the Request and exhibits attached thereto, it appears Plaintiff has state felony charges pending against him but has been found incompetent pursuant to California Penal Code section 1368 and was transferred

Court has screened the Complaint as prescribed by 28 U.S.C. § 1915A and 42 U.S.C. § 1997e. For the reasons discussed below, the Court DISMISSES Plaintiff's Complaint WITH LEAVE TO AMEND.²

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Congress mandates that district courts initially screen civil complaints filed by prisoners seeking redress from a governmental entity or employee. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. A court may dismiss such a complaint, or any portion thereof, if the court concludes that the complaint: (1) is frivolous or malicious, (2) fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or (3) seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. Id. § 1915A(b); see also id. § 1915(e)(2) ("[The court] shall dismiss the case at any time if the court determines that . . . the action . . . (i) is frivolous or malicious; (ii) fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted; or (iii) seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief."); accord Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1126-27 & n.7 (9th Cir. 2000) (en banc). In addition, dismissal may be appropriate if a complaint violates Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. McHenry

from Twin Towers to Patton State Hospital. The Request - which will be addressed by separate order - seeks an order discharging Plaintiff from the hospital and releasing him from state custody. (Request at 1-2).

 $^{^2}$ Magistrate judges may dismiss a complaint with leave to amend without approval from the district judge. McKeever v. Block, 932 F.2d 795, 798 (9th Cir. 1991).

<u>v. Renne</u>, 84 F.3d 1172, 1179 (9th Cir. 1996); <u>Nevijel v. Northcoast</u> Life Ins. Co., 651 F.2d 671, 673 (9th Cir. 1981).

In considering whether to dismiss a complaint, a court is generally limited to the pleadings and must construe "[a]ll factual allegations set forth in the complaint . . . as true and . . . in the light most favorable" to the plaintiff. Lee v. City of Los Angeles, 250 F.3d 668, 688 (9th Cir. 2001) (citation omitted). Moreover, pro se pleadings are "to be liberally construed" and "held to less stringent standards" than those drafted by a lawyer. Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (citation omitted). Nevertheless, dismissal for failure to state a claim can be warranted based on either the lack of a cognizable legal theory or the absence of factual support for a cognizable legal theory. Mendiondo v. Centinela Hosp. Med. Ctr., 521 F.3d 1097, 1104 (9th Cir. 2008).

DISCUSSION

Plaintiff's Complaint warrants dismissal for violation of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8, among other deficiencies addressed below. Leave to amend is granted, however, because it is not "absolutely clear that the deficiencies of the complaint could not be cured by amendment." Akhtar v. Mesa, 698 F.3d 1202, 1212 (9th Cir. 2012).

Rule 8 requires that a complaint contain "'a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to

relief,' in order to 'give the defendant fair notice of what the . . . claim is and the grounds upon which it rests.'" Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)). "Each allegation must be simple, concise, and direct." Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(d)(1). Conclusory allegations are insufficient. See Ashcroft v. Igbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678, 686 (2009). A complaint is subject to dismissal for violating Rule 8 if "one cannot determine from the complaint who is being sued, for what relief, and on what theory." McHenry, 84 F.3d at 1178; see also Cafasso, U.S. ex rel. v. Gen. Dynamics C4 Sys., Inc., 637 F.3d 1047, 1058-59 (9th Cir. 2011) (a complaint violates Rule 8 if a defendant would have difficulty understanding and responding to the complaint); McKeever v. Block, 932 F.2d 795, 798 (9th Cir. 1991) (noting that under Rule 8(a) a complaint must contain "sufficient allegations to put defendants fairly on notice of the claims against them").

Plaintiff's Complaint violates Rule 8 because it fails to provide adequate notice of the claims he is asserting. The Complaint appears to assert several vague, unrelated claims — listed as "wrongful arrest, denial of a speedy trial[,] cruel and unusual punishment[,] food poisoning[,] denial in medicine[,] illegal detainer[,] unlawful detention[,] [and] due process violation" (Compl. at 5)3 — with no clear indication of the legal grounds and factual circumstances at issue in each claim. The

³ In quoting from Plaintiff's handwritten Complaint, this Order omits some arbitrary capitalization.

Complaint also contains a series of disconnected factual allegations with little context. For example, Plaintiff asserts that Defendant Moran "continu[ou]sly spread rumors" about Plaintiff to the Twin Towers nursing staff that "led to denying [Plaintiff] processing in treatment and movement that would have assured [him] proper procedures in transportation to and from court as well as medical screenings to July 15, 2022." (Compl. at 5). Elsewhere in the Complaint, Plaintiff writes that Moran is liable for "defamation of character, instructing nursing staff to deny medications to Plaintiff." (Compl. at 4). Plaintiff offers no other facts about this. He thus fails to specify the nature of Moran's "rumors," how these alleged rumors caused Plaintiff to receive improper treatment or transportation, the type of treatment or transportation Plaintiff required and why, or what harm resulted. Without such facts, Defendant cannot adequately discern the basis for the claim(s) against him and properly respond.

Plaintiff also states that Defendants Gonzalez and Leora, on April 11, 2022, conspired to prepare "multiple meals that can cause an untimely death" and "coerc[ed] other employees to deny [Plaintiff] services that can cure or prevent the consumption of hazardous waste." (Compl. at 5). Plaintiff further asserts that Twin Towers custody personnel caused him to be subjected to a "food poisoning dinner" on January 22 and March 15, 2024. (Compl. at 7). Yet, Plaintiff does not specify how each of these Defendants was involved in the meals, nor does he allege facts indicating whether Defendants were (or should have been) aware of the harm posed by the food, or what harm resulted. Again, without such facts,

Defendants cannot sufficiently understand the basis for the claims being asserted against them or respond appropriately.

Plaintiff's other allegations are similarly inadequate. He states, for example, that officers coerced a psychiatrist or psychologist to write disciplinary reports to "deny actions, services, medicine, [and] religious meal[s]." (Compl. at 7). He also appears to claim that an "unlawful detainer" was filed in August 2022, as a result of which he was "transported to Patton State Hospital and back to [Twin Towers] without trial." (Compl. at 5). Plaintiff does not seem to provide any other facts about these circumstances, and it is unclear if or how they relate to the other circumstances alleged in the Complaint.

Moreover, to the extent Plaintiff intends to assert federal claims against Twin Towers — construed as claims against the County of Los Angeles⁴ — Plaintiff must allege facts showing that a policy, custom, or practice of the municipal entity was the cause of a violation of Plaintiff's constitutional rights. See Villegas v. Gilroy Garlic Festival Ass'n, 541 F.3d 950, 957 (9th Cir. 2008). "[P]roof of a single incident of unconstitutional activity," or even a series of "isolated or sporadic incidents," will not give rise to the entity's liability under § 1983. Gant v. County of Los Angeles, 772 F.3d 608, 618 (9th Cir. 2014) (citation omitted). Rather, liability must be "founded upon practices of sufficient

⁴ It is unclear whether Twin Towers itself is properly subject to suit, but the Court need not resolve that issue at this juncture.

duration, frequency and consistency that the conduct has become a traditional method of carrying out policy." Trevino v. Gates, 99 F.3d 911, 918 (9th Cir. 1996).

Accordingly, the Complaint warrants dismissal with leave to amend for violation of Rule 8 because Defendants would have difficulty understanding and responding to Plaintiff's claims. To remedy this problem, Plaintiff must, at a minimum, provide clear factual allegations against each Defendant and expressly identify which Defendant(s) are sued in each claim and which allegations are at issue in each claim. See Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 & n.3 (complaint must allege enough specific facts to provide both "fair notice" of the particular claim being asserted and "the grounds upon which [that claim] rests").

In addition, to the extent that the Complaint challenges the fact or duration of his state custody, such claims are not cognizable in this § 1983 action and must instead be brought separately in a properly filed petition for writ of habeas corpus under 42 U.S.C. § 2254. See Pinson v. Carvajal, 69 F.4th 1059, 1071 (9th Cir. 2023) ("[A]n action sounds in habeas 'no matter the relief sought (damages or equitable relief), no matter the target of the prisoner's suit . . . if success in that action would necessarily demonstrate the invalidity of confinement or its duration.'" (quoting Wilkinson v. Dotson, 544 U.S. 74, 82 (2005))). Moreover, if such claims concern criminal proceedings that remain pending in state court, they may be barred by Younger v. Harris, 401 U.S. 37 (1971).

CONCLUSION

3 |

For the reasons discussed above, the Court DISMISSES Plaintiff's claims WITH LEAVE TO AMEND.

If Plaintiff still wishes to pursue this action, he shall file a First Amended Complaint no later than 30 days from the date of this Order. The First Amended Complaint must cure the pleading defects discussed above and shall be complete in itself without reference to the Complaint. See L.R. 15-2 ("Every amended pleading filed as a matter of right or allowed by order of the Court shall be complete including exhibits. The amended pleading shall not refer to the prior, superseding pleading."). This means that Plaintiff must allege and plead any viable claims in the Complaint again.

In any amended complaint, Plaintiff should identify the nature of each separate legal claim and confine his allegations to those operative facts supporting each of his claims. For each separate legal claim, Plaintiff should state the civil right that has been violated and the supporting facts for that claim only. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a), all that is required is a "short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." However, Plaintiff is advised that the allegations in the First Amended Complaint should be consistent with the authorities discussed above. In addition, the First Amended Complaint may not include new defendants or claims not reasonably related to the allegations in the previously filed

complaint. Plaintiff is strongly encouraged to utilize the standard civil rights complaint form when filing any amended complaint, a copy of which is attached.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

Plaintiff is explicitly cautioned that failure to timely file a First Amended Complaint, or failure to correct the deficiencies described above, may result in a recommendation that this action, or portions thereof, be dismissed with prejudice for failure to prosecute and/or failure to comply with court orders. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); Applied Underwriters, Inc. v. Lichtenegger, 913 F.3d 884, 891 (9th Cir. 2019) ("The failure of the plaintiff eventually to respond to the court's ultimatum - either by amending the complaint or by indicating to the court that it will not do so is properly met with the sanction of a Rule 41(b) dismissal.") (emphasis omitted) (quoting Edwards v. Marin Park, Inc., 356 F.3d 1058, 1065 (9th Cir. 2004)). Plaintiff is further advised that if he no longer wishes to pursue this action in its entirety or with respect to particular defendants or claims, he may voluntarily dismiss all or any part of this action by filing a Notice of Dismissal in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(1). A form Notice of Dismissal is attached for Plaintiff's convenience.

23

IT IS SO ORDERED.

25

26

24

Dated: June 21, 2024

27

ALKA SAGAR UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

/s/



